

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USNATO 04403 01 OF 02 301023Z
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-05 INR-10 L-03 ACDA-12
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 SP-02 ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSC-05
/077 W

-----120524 301133Z /10

R 301011Z APR 78
FM USMISSION USNATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1209
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
DA WASHDC
CNO WASHDC
CSAF WASHDC

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 02 USNATO 04403

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: OCON, NATO, MILI
SUBJECT: TRANSATLANTIC DIALOG (TAD)

SUMMARY: NATIONAL ARMAMENTS DIRECTORS (NADS) AND
THEIR REPRESENTATIVES DISCUSSED TRANSATLANTIC
DIALOG (TAD) BOTH IN CNAD AND AT A SUBSEQUENT
INFORMAL MEETING ON 27 APR 78. US NAD PERRY MADE
A SIGNIFICANT INTERVENTION IN CNAD ITSELF CLARIFYING
OBJECTIVES AS THE US SEES THEM (PARA 1 BELOW).
THE INFORMAL MEETING WAS ESPECIALLY USEFUL IN
CLARIFYING IEPG AND NORTH AMERICAN (N.A.) POSITIONS.
SEVERAL IEPG NATIONS STRESSED THAT MANY OF THE
ISSUES US WANTS TO PURSUE IN TAD ARE ALREADY BEING
WORKED IN CNAD. THEY ALSO ADMITTED THAT AD HOC
GROUP I ON OBSTACLES WAS PUT FORWARD INITIALLY
AS ONE OF THE FEW AREAS WHERE EUROPEANS COULD
AGREE. US REP STRESSED THAT US WANTS TO UNDERSTAND
FUTURE OF BROADER APPROACH (WITH GPS II AND III
ON RATIONALIZATION AND INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USNATO 04403 01 OF 02 301023Z

BEFORE AGREEING TO GROUP I ON OBSTACLES. END SUMMARY.

1. AT THE 21ST MEETING OF THE CNAD ON THE 26TH OF
APRIL, THE IEPG RESPONDED FORMALLY TO THE NORTH
AMERICAN PROPOSAL ALONG THE LINES REPORTED SEPTTEL,
LEAVING THE FOCUS LARGELY ON OBSTACLES TO PENETRATION
OF N.A. AND EUROPEAN MARKETS. SUBSEQUENT DISCUSSION

WAS INHIBITED BY THE NECESSITY THAT IEPG SPEAK WITH ONE VOICE AND ADHERE TO THE FORMAL RESPONSE. CANADIAN NAD CRUTCHLOW CALLED FOR A BROADER DIALOGUE THAT WOULD ACCENTUATE POSITIVE ELEMENTS AS WELL AS FACTORS INHIBITING COOPERATION BETWEEN EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA.

US NAD PERRY RESPONDED TO THE IEPG THAT:

- A. THE OBJECTIVE OF THE TRANSATLANTIC DIALOGUE SHOULD BE TO DETERMINE WAYS OF INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF OUR EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION PROGRAMMES SO THAT WE CAN EXPLOIT OUR TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL BASE TO COMPETE EFFECTIVELY WITH THE WARSAW PACT FORCES.

- B. THIS IS AN URGENT TASK BECAUSE THE WARSAW PACT IS OUT-PRODUCING US AND OUR DEFENCE RESOURCES ARE BEING INEFFICIENTLY USED BECAUSE OF REDUNDANCY IN R&D AND A PROLIFERATION OF LOW-VOLUME PRODUCTION RUNS.

-

- C. THERE IS A NEED TO SHARE EQUITABLY AMONG NATIONS THE ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF ARMAMENT PROGRAMMES; AND SUCCESS IN THIS SHARING REQUIRES COOPERATION
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USNATO 04403 01 OF 02 301023Z

EARLY IN THE ACQUISITION PROCESS, WITH A STRONG EMPHASIS ON RATIONALIZING MILITARY NEEDS AND R&D.

- D. THE TRANSATLANTIC DIALOGUE SHOULD FOCUS ON THE CONSTRUCTIVE ACTIONS THAT CAN BE TAKEN TO FACILITATE THIS COOPERATION INCLUDING A PROGRAMME FOR DIVIDING AMONG NATIONS THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR NEW SYSTEM DEVELOPMENTS, WITH SUITABLE PROVISIONS FOR SHARING TECHNOLOGY TO FACILITATE THESE DEVELOPMENTS.

2. THE FRG AND FRENCH NADS BOTH TOOK THE VIEW THAT BROADER ISSUES COULD BE, AND ARE BEING, ADDRESSED IN THE CNAD AND THAT THE TAD SHOULD BEGIN AT THIS TIME BY ADDRESSING OBSTACLES. PERRY RESPONDED THAT, AS HE JUDGED FROM THE PAST AND PRESENT CNADS, THE KIND OF ISSUES AND PROGRAMS THAT THE US PROPOSES TO ADDRESS IN THE TAD ARE NOT BEING ADDRESSED IN CNAD. FOR EXAMPLE, THE IDENTIFICATION AND DETERMINATION OF ARMAMENTS PROGRAMS THAT WOULD BE PURSUED BY EUROPE AND THOSE THAT WOULD BE PURSUED BY NORTH AMERICA.

3. THE NADS AGREED TO AN INFORMAL MEETING AT DEP NAD LEVEL ON 27 APRIL TO FURTHER CLARIFY THE ISSUES. REPS OF FOLLOWING COUNTRIES ATTENDED: BE, CA, DE, FR, FRG, IT, NE, NO, PO, UK, US. US REPS INCLUDED DR. GARBER AND MR. DEJONGE OF OUDRE (IP) AND MR. GOMPERT DEP DIR PM IN STATE.

4. ASYG WALSH CHAIRED THE MEETING. US DEPNAD GARBER SUPPORTED BY CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE JANIGAN EXPLAINED IN GREATER DETAIL THE OBJECTIVES OF THE TWO GROUPS PROPOSED PREVIOUSLY BY NORTH AMERICA AND AMPLIFIED

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USNATO 04403 02 OF 02 301030Z
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 NSC-05 CIAE-00 PM-05 INR-10 L-03
ACDA-12 NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 SP-02 ICA-11 TRSE-00
/077 W

-----120549 301031Z /10

R 301011Z APR 78
FM USMISSION USNATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1210
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
DA WASHDC
CNO WASHDC
CSAF WASHDC

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 02 OF 02 USNATO 04403

ON THE OVERALL GOALS AS OUTLINED BY PERRY. REACTING TO THE IEPG CHARGE THAT THE US PROPOSALS WERE TOO GENERAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL, GARBER INDICATED THAT THE US INTENDED TO BE QUITE SPECIFIC AND PRAGMATIC IN CONSIDERING THE ISSUES THAT WE EXPECTED TO DISCUSS IN THE TWO PROPOSED GROUPS WHICH WOULD SUPPLEMENT THE GROUP ON OBSTACLES. IN GROUP II ON RATIONALIZATION OF RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION, WE WOULD HOPE JOINTLY TO IDENTIFY AREAS OF RESPECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ARMAMENTS DEVELOPMENT. EUROPE COULD TAKE THE DEVELOPMENT LEADERSHIP ON SOME SYSTEMS AND NORTH AMERICA IN OTHERS. SUCH A DIALOGUE SHOULD NOT WAIT UNTIL EUROPE, IN ISOLATION, DETERMINES AND PRESENTS TO NORTH AMERICA AS "FAIT ACCOMPLIS", SYSTEMS THAT NA WOULD BE EXPECTED TO PURCHASE.

MUCH GREATER PROGRESS COULD BE MADE IF, FOR EXAMPLE, THERE WERE AN OPPORTUNITY FIRST TO DISCUSS SYSTEMS THAT MIGHT BE AVAILABLE FOR LICENSED PRODUCTION OR CO-PRODUCTION, OR SYSTEMS ON WHICH NA OR EUROPE WOULD CONSIDER FOREGOING DEVELOPMENT. AFTER CONSIDERING
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USNATO 04403 02 OF 02 301030Z

SUCH POSSIBILITIES, THE IEPG COULD TRY TO REACH A "ONE VOICE" RESPONSE, GARBER SUGGESTED.

5. SIMILARLY THERE WERE URGENT ISSUES THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED IN GROUP III ON INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION. FOR EXAMPLE, SHOULD WE ENCOURAGE TEAMING BY NA AND EUROPEAN INDUSTRY? UNDER WHAT CONDITIONS IS SUCH TEAMING DESIRABLE? WILL THE GOVERNMENTS BE SUPPORTIVE OF THE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER INVOLVED IN SUCH INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION? AND ARE THERE ANY SPECIFIC STEPS THAT COULD BE TAKEN TO CREATE A FAVORABLE CLIMATE FOR TRANSATLANTIC INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION?

6. THE FRENCH AND BELGIAN DELEGATES POINTED OUT THAT THEY SEE THE GOALS OF THE IEPG AS IN AGREEMENT WITH THE GOALS AND PRINCIPLES VOICED BY THE US, THAT THE EXPLANATIONS BY NA WERE USEFUL AND THAT THE PRIMARY PROBLEM FOR IEPG IS REACHING DECISIONS ALLOWING IT TO SPEAK WITH ONE VOICE. THEY SAID THAT WAS THE REASON WHY THEY HOPED THE US COULD START THE TAD ON THOSE TOPICS THAT THE IEPG HAD BEEN ABLE TO AGREE ON -- NAMELY, TO DISCUSS OBSTACLES ON BOTH SIDES, AND THEY DID NOT INTEND TO PROJECT AN "AGGRESSIVE" OR ACCUSATORY POSTURE.

-

7. THE UK REP, AND OTHERS, WONDERED WHAT THE PROPOSED GROUP II WOULD DO THAT PERIODIC ARMAMENTS PLANNING SYSTEM (PAPS) OR NATO ARMAMENTS PLANNING REVIEW (NAPR) WOULD NOT DO. THE US POINTED OUT THAT PAPS AND NAPR WERE NECESSARY INPUTS TO THE TYPE OF ISSUES THAT WOULD BE RESOLVED IN GROUP II
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USNATO 04403 02 OF 02 301030Z

BUT DID NOT PROVIDE THE FORUM FOR RESOLVING SUCH ISSUES. THE NETHERLANDS REP SUGGESTED THAT EVERYONE SHOULD STRESS THE POSITIVE ASPECTS OF TAD TO DATE, INCLUDING THE IEPG AGREEMENT TO SET UP AN APPROPRIATE

GROUP FOR THE DIALOGUE, THE BROADENED OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED GROUP I TO CONSIDER OBSTACLES ON BOTH SIDES OF THE ATLANTIC, AND AN INVESTIGATION RATHER THAN A REJECTION OF THE US PROPOSALS FOR TWO SUPPLEMENTARY GROUPS.

8. THE US REP INDICATED THAT WE HAD ALREADY ADDRESSED OBSTACLES AT THE MARCH TAD AND THAT WE ARE PREPARED TO DO SO AGAIN AT THE NEXT MEETING WHICH REPS TENTATIVELY AGREED TO HOLD ON JUNE 28-29. IT WAS FURTHER AGREED THAT BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING US AND CANADA WOULD PROVIDE REVISED COPIES OF THE PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR GROUPS II AND III AS WELL AS BACKGROUND PAPERS EXPLAINING THEIR OBJECTIVES. AT THE JUNE MEETING, THE TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR ALL THREE PROPOSED GROUPS WOULD EITHER BE ACCEPTED OR RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE TO THE IEPG NADS MEETING IN OCTOBER.

9. EVERYONE AGREED THAT THE MEETING WAS USEFUL AND CONTRIBUTED TO MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING. BENNETT

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: STANDARDS, ACQUISITION, EQUIPMENT, ALLIANCE, COMMITTEE MEETINGS, DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS, MEETING REPORTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 30 apr 1978
Decaption Date: 01 jan 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978USNATO04403
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780184-1196
Format: TEL
From: USNATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t1978041/aaaaaaak.tel
Line Count: 245
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 3a32b2a5-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 27 may 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2811080
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: TRANSATLANTIC DIALOG (TAD) SUMMARY: NATIONAL ARMAMENTS DIRECTORS (NADS) AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES
DISCUSSED TRANSATLANTIC
TAGS: OCON, MILI, NATO
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
vdkgvkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/3a32b2a5-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014